

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 15 and 16, and amend claim 5 as follows:

Claim 5, line 2, change "a" to --the--.

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending. By this Amendment, withdrawn claims 15 and 16 are cancelled. The specification and claim 5 are amended, and drawing corrections are proposed.

Initially, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner return an initialed copy of Page 2 of 2 of applicant's form PTO-1449 submitted with the IDS filed on January 17, 2000. The outstanding Office Action, mailed December 20, 2000, included an initialed Page 1 of 2, but not Page 2 of 2. For the Examiner's convenience, submitted herewith is a copy of the second page (Page 2 of 2) of applicant's form PTO-1449.

The drawings were objected-to for noted informalities. Responsive to these objections, applicant has enclosed corrected drawing Figures 2, 3, 8 and 9, together with a formal Request For Approval. Figure 2 is amended to label reserve web 39. Figure 3 is amended to label working web 17. Figures 8 and 9 are amended to label slots 123.

The specification was objected-to for noted informalities. Applicant has amended the specification responsive to the objections.

Claims 1 and 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for alleged indefiniteness. Claim 5 is amended, in accordance with the Examiner's comments, in order to obviate this rejection. Claim 5 now recites "the stub roll" to confirm that the stub roll referred to is the one introduced in claim 4 (from which claim 5 depends).


With respect to claims 1, 3 and 7, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. It is agreed that the pre-feed portion of sheet material web is not positively set forth in the subject claims. This does not, however, render the subject claims indefinite.

It is permissible to define a claimed structure in terms of how that structure interacts in a completed assembly. *In re Venezia*, 189 U.S.P.Q. 149, 152 (C.C.P.A. 1976) (copy attached). For example, claim 31 of the application at issue in *In re Venezia* was drawn to a splice connector kit for joining the ends of two high voltage shielded electrical cables. As claimed, the connector kit included a pair of sleeves *adapted to be fitted* over an insulating jacket of one of the high voltage cables. It will be appreciated that the pair of sleeves, which were positively recited in the claim, were defined in terms of structure not positively recited in the claim, namely the high voltage cable. The court held that the claims define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention with a reasonable degree of precision and particularity, and that they are, therefore, definite as required by the second paragraph of § 112.” *Id.* at 151. Similar to the claims at issue in *In re Venezia*, claims 1, 3, and 7 of the present application define the metes and bounds of the claimed invention with the reasonable degree of precision and particularity required to satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2.

No prior art rejections have been applied. Accordingly, for all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. In view of the allowability of claims 1 and 3-8, and in accordance with the Examiner’s indication concerning rejoinder of withdrawn dependent claims, rejoinder of dependent claims 2 and 9-14, and allowance of all of claims 1-14, is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better form for allowance, he is respectfully urged to telephone applicant's undersigned representative at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,


Christopher L. McKee
Registration No. 32,384

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 508-9100

Date: January 31, 2001